

REMARKS

This communication responds to the Office Action dated August 25, 2008.

Claims 1, 16, and 23 are amended. Claims 1, 2, and 5-31 are pending in this application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

1. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-19, 23-26, and 28-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belknap (US 6,763,377) in view of Zhu (US 6,763,501) and the SMIL specification (SMIL 2.0 W3C Recommendation). Claims 1, 16, and 23 were amended to more clearly recite the subject matter. Support for the amendments is found generally within the Patent Application (*see e.g.*, pg. 4 lines 24-26 and FIG. 2).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because the cited portions of Belknap, Zhu, and the SMIL specification, either individually or in combination with each other or with any objective reasoning of the Office Action, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, the present subject matter of these claims.

For example, Applicant cannot find in the cited portions of Belknap, Zhu, and the SMIL specification, among other things, a video file server comprising

at least one playlist in the video file server, each playlist including at least one track, wherein the track includes an identifier to select one or more of the number of video files and includes at least one logical action related to playing the playlist,

as presently similarly recited in claim 1, 16, and 23, and incorporated into claims 2, 5, 6, 8-15, 17-19, 24-26, and 28-31. As shown in Fig. 5, the processor of the video file server executes software to push video content identified by the tracks of the playlist according to the logical actions included in a track.

The Office Action concedes that Belknap in view of Zhu does not expressly teach each playlist including logical actions related to playing the playlist, but that the SMIL specification describes a playlist format wherein the playlist may include logical actions related to playing the playlist.¹ However, the SMIL specification relates to an XML-based language that allows

¹ Office Action, pg. 6.

authors to write interactive multimedia presentations.² Therefore, the SMIL specification does not teach or suggest a track that includes at least one logical action related to playing the playlist, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the proposed combination of Belknap, Zhu, and the SMIL specification does not teach or suggest all of the elements recited or incorporated into these claims.

Additionally, Applicant cannot find,

wherein each video file server includes a virtual display driver, that appears to be a video display to the video file server, to translate video content into application independent video content, thereby not requiring the media server to decode pushed video content,

as recited in claim 1. The Office Action apparently reads the Application Server 106 onto the video server recited in claim 1, and states that an application and document server ... includes a virtual display driver (Fig. 4 Element 406 ...) ... to translate video content into application independent video content³. However, Zhu states that client document serving application 210 includes an application viewer 308 and an editing module 312. Thus in Zhu, the client requires an application viewer to view the video content, and Zhu does not teach or suggest “[translating] video content into application independent video content, thereby not requiring the media server to decode pushed video content.”

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably be led to combine Belknap, Zhu and the SMIL specification. The Office Action states the simple substitution of the SMIL playlist format replacing the playlist format disclosed by Belknap in view of Zhu would have been obvious because such a substitution would have produced predictable results in view of the SMIL format’s utility for playing videos according to a playlist, as required by the video server of Belknap in view of Zhu.⁴ However, Belknap refers to a schedule list 1214 on a GUI screen 1200 for displaying a list of schedule entries, and that the GUI provides a centralized interface for remotely managing assets. The SMIL specification relates to an XML based language that allows authors to write interactive multimedia presentations.⁵ One of ordinary skill would not be

² SMIL specification, Abstract.

³ Office Action, pg. 5.

⁴ Office Action, pg. 6.

⁵ SMIL specification, Abstract.

led to combine the XML based SMIL format with Belknap to solve a problem already solved by the GUI of Belknap.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-19, 23-26, and 28-31.

2. Claims 7, 20-22, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belknap in view of Zhu, the SMIL specification, and further in view of Duso (US 5,892,915). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because the cited portions of Belknap, Zhu, the SMIL specification, and Duso, either individually or in combination with each other or with any objective reasoning of the Office Action, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the present subject matter of these claims.

Claim 7 ultimately depends on claim 6, claims 20-22 ultimately depend on base claim 16m and claim 27 ultimately depends on claim 23. As set forth above, Belknap, Zhu, and the SMIL specification do not teach or suggest all of the elements of the base claims. Duso fails to teach or suggest the missing elements. For example, Applicant cannot find in the cited portions of Belknap, Zhu, the SMIL specification, or Duso, among other things,

at least one playlist in the video file server, each playlist including at least one track, wherein the track includes an identifier to select one or more of the number of video files and includes at least one logical action related to playing the playlist,

as presently similarly incorporated into claim 7, 20-22, and 27.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 7, 20-22, and 27.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (612) 371-2172 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 371-2172

Date Nov. 25, 2008

By Paul J. Urbanski
Paul J. Urbanski
Reg. No. 58,351

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 25 day of November 2008.

Leshere R Wolfe

Name

Chris Brendley
Signature